REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 18 and 36 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1 and 18 being independent.

Independent Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to further distinguish Applicants' invention from the cited art.

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended toward their representative during the personal interview of October 9, 2008. The interview focused primarily on independent Claim 1 and the patents to Negishi '278 and Birkler '103.

All of the claims, i.e., Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 18 and 36, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Negishi in view of Birkler. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicants' invention relates to an information processing method for maintaining, in a system in which each of a plurality of client processes connected via an information transmission medium holds and uses shared data to be shared by the plurality of client processes, consistency of shared data held by the respective plurality of client processes. The method includes an inputting step of inputting an input manipulation request generated by its own client process, a determining step of determining a mode, based on designation information used to designate a mode to be adopted to each of a plurality of items included in the shared data, and manipulation contents of the input manipulation request, from a plurality of modes including a first mode, a second mode, and a third mode, and a processing step of executing a process corresponding to the manipulation request input in the input step or a received manipulation request generated by another client process. The determining step determines that the mode

corresponding to the manipulation request is the first mode or the second mode, when the manipulation contents of the input manipulation request is based on a user's interactive manipulation.

As amended, Claim 1 recites that, with regard to execution of the received manipulation request, the processing step includes receiving the received manipulation request generated by a client process other than its own client process, via a server process, and executing a process corresponding to the received manipulation request in order of receiving the received manipulation request.

Claim 1 further recites, with regard to execution of the input manipulation request input in the input step, that the processing step includes sending, when the manipulation request requests a manipulation of the shared data, request information that represents the input manipulation request to the server process, receiving response information corresponding to the request information sent in the sending step, from the server process, and executing the manipulation for the shared data in accordance with the input manipulation request or the response information received in the reception step. In a case where the determining step determines that the mode corresponding to the input manipulation request is the first mode, the manipulation execution step manipulates the shared data in response to the input manipulation request and the sending step sends the request information indicating the input manipulation request to the server process. In a case where the determining step determines that the mode corresponding to the input manipulation request is the second mode, the sending step sends the request information indicating the manipulation request to the server process in response to the input manipulation request, the manipulation execution step manipulates the shared data based

on the indicated input manipulation request in response to reception of the reception information when the reception information is received from the server process within a time limit of manipulation execution, and the manipulation execution step manipulates the shared data in accordance with the input manipulation request corresponding to the request information when the reception information is not received from the server process within a time limit of manipulation execution. Finally, in a case where the determining step determines that the mode corresponding to the input manipulation request input in the input step is the third mode, the sending step sends, in accordance with the input manipulation request, request information that represents the input manipulation request to the server process, and the manipulation execution step manipulates the shared data in accordance with the input manipulation request corresponding to the request information in response to reception of the reception information.

Support for the amendments to Claim 1 can be found, for example, in Figure 16 (step S1608), Figure 17 (step S1704) and in Figure 18 (step S1804), and the corresponding specification beginning on page 23, line 6. In accordance with Applicants' claimed invention, a high performance information processing method is able to execute a process for a manipulation request generated by its own client process and a manipulation request generated by another client process. In executing the input manipulation request generated by its own client process, three different modes are provided for maintaining consistency of shared data.

As discussed at the personal interview, the primary citation to <u>Negishi</u> relates to a system for sharing data between computers (computer A and computer B). As shown in Figure 2, computer A transmits a response BT or response SBT, and transmitted data can be manipulated to control a correct order of manipulation request, regardless of what order they are

received in. Negishi discloses four designations, or modes, (i.e., ordinary, forward flush, backward flush, and two way flush) to designate the order of the replica.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, however, Negishi does not teach or suggest, among other features, executing a process corresponding to a received manipulation request generated by another client process and executing a process correspond to an input manipulation request generated by its own client process, with the input manipulation request having three different modes.

With respect to Birkler, the secondary citation relates to an instant messaging system and is relied on for a teaching of using a request/response protocol implementation and a time out method. Birkler fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Negishi as discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Therefore, the proposed combination of art, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention.

Claim 18 is directed to an information processing apparatus and corresponds substantially to Claim 1. Claim 18 is therefore submitted to be patentable over the cited art for the same reasons discussed above.

Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 18 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 6, 8, 9, 11 and 36 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM:mm

FCHS_WS 2663679v1